ED 021 622 PS 001 071

By- O'Reilly, Joan M.
PILOT STUDY OF FIVE METHODS OF PRESENTING THE SUMMER HEAD START CURRICULUM PROGRAM.
Detroit Public Schools, Mich.
Pub Date Mar 68
Note- 20p.
EDRS Price MF -$0.25 HC -$0.80
Descriptors- *COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, *CURRICULUM EVALUATION, *EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULUM, LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, MULTISENSORY LEARNING, *PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS, READINESS, TEACHING GUIDES, TEACHING METHODS, VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT
Identifiers- Bereiter Program, Doman Delacato Frostig Program, *Head Start

A pilot study was conducted to assess the effectiveness of five curricular methods used in a summer Head Start program designed to develop perceptual-motor skills. Three hundred and seventy-three inner-city children in 15 Head Start centers were given the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Brenner Developmental Gestalt Test of School Readiness at the beginning and end of the program. Children in the Frostig Experimental and Control Centers were pretested and posttested with the Marianne Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception. Children in the Doman Delacato Experimental and Control Centers were pretested and posttested for lateral and visual dominance in three areas: handedness, footedness, and eyedness. The methods used in the Bereiter Experimental Center were prescribed by the Bereiter curriculum. Teachers and aides filled out evaluative questionnaires. Test gains of Head Start center pupils were compared to gains of children in centers using curricular modifications. The total population showed improvement at the .01 level of significance on these variables: vocabulary, total school readiness, achievement-ability assessment, and social-emotional behavior. None of the experimental teaching methods was found to be strikingly superior to the multisensory program prescribed by the basic Detroit Head Start and kindergarten program. (WS)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Detroit Public Schools

SUMMARY OF PROJECT EVALUATION

Research and Development March, 1968

Title Pilot Study of Five Methods of Presenting the Summer Head Start Curricular Program

Purpose To assess the effectiveness of five curricular methods of presenting the Summer Head Start Program in developing perceptual-motor skills of children.

Investigator Early Childhood Education Department and Research and Development Department, Joan M. O'Fiela, Research Associate

Participants Three hundred seventy-three children enrolled in the 1967 Summer Head Start Program.

Period June 26, 1967 to August 18, 1967

Procedures The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Bremner Developmental Gestalt Test of School Readiness were administered to all subjects at the beginning and end of the Summer Head Start Program.

Children in the Frostig Experimental and Control Centers were pre- and posttested with the Marianne Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception. Children in the Roman Balmate Experimental and Control Centers were pre- and posttested for lateral and visual dominance in three areas, handedness, footedness, and eyedness.

Teachers and classroom personnel responded to evaluative questionnaires at the end of the program. Teachers in the Experimental Head Start Experience Record Centers evaluated the experimental Experience Record Form and the experimental handbook, Young Children In School.

Analysis Raw score gains on tests administered to Head Start pupils were computed for comparison of gains among Head Start Centers employing modifications in the basic Head Start curricular program.

Findings The data indicate that the total Head Start population showed improvement at the .01 level of significance on the variables evaluated: vocabulary, total readiness for school, achievement-ability assessment, and social-emotional behavior.

Boys in the 4-4.11 age range had lower basal scores on all variables than girls of the same age. The mean gain in vocabulary raw score for both boys and girls was 1.9; however, the basal score of girls was 1.3 higher than that of the boys. The boys' gain score of 9.7 in overall readiness (significant at .01) was 2.9 points higher than the girls significant gain score of 6.8 in overall readiness.

PS 001071 ED021622

There was a positive shift in both numbers and percents of children from the low readiness category right on through the high readiness designation from pretest to posttest.

Conclusions

The overall readiness totals of the Head Start Experience Record Control schools show superiority over the Head Start Experience Record Experimental schools in mean gains except in one experimental center, but inferiority to the Head Start Experience Record Experimental schools on the vocabulary mean gains in raw scores.

The Ypsan Zaleznio Experimental and Servitor Experimental groups showed superiority over the Frostig Experimental and Control groups in mean gain of total school readiness but inferiority to the Frostig Experimental and Control groups on mean gains in vocabulary raw scores

There is no evidence in the data collected and reported in this study of the overwhelming superiority of any one of the curricular methods tried and observed in which the teaching emphasis is different than prescribed by the basic Detroit Head Start and Kindergarten curricular multi-sensory program.

Teachers reported that the experimental handbook, Young Children in School, was very helpful in identifying curriculum practices which aid in teaching skills necessary for successful school experience.

SUMMER HEAD START RESEARCH, 1967

The purposes of the research in the 1967 Summer Head Start Program were to establish evaluative base line data about the perceptual-motor skills of children in the program and to examine (on a pilot basis) the merits of five methods of presenting the Head Start curricular program.

The data from the study may assist in the selection of curricular programs for any follow-up program in which these children are enrolled. The data may also be important for any school interested in providing the experiences children need to prepare them to read in the primary unit of their school experience.

The Detroit Summer Head Start Program did not attempt to teach reading. The emphasis in the summer Head Start curricular program was to present to the children a variety of enrichment experiences which would foster perceptual-motor development. In this setting, the Head Start research was designed to examine five curricular approaches. A brief description of each curricular method follows:

1. Detroit Head Start with Experience Record (Experimental)

   This curricular approach embodied the guiding principles of the Detroit Head Start Program--perceptual and conceptual development through multi-sensory experiences. An experimental handbook, Young Children in School, was provided for teachers to use in making a selection of experiences fostering the building of basic skills that are necessary for successful school experience. A Head Start Personal Experience Record (Digitak Form) was devised to aid in projecting a profile of the kinds and depth of experiences children were having in auditory and visual discrimination, concrete and abstract quantitative thinking, fine and large motor control, and tactile learning. In addition to the staffing pattern found in all Detroit Head Start classrooms, one research aide was hired for each of the five Detroit Head Start Experimental Centers using the Experience Record to assist in the task of making observations and filling out the research forms.

2. Detroit Head Start Control Centers

   The curricular program in the control centers was the basic perceptual-conceptual multi-sensory program. Teachers were provided with the handbook, Young Children in School, but were given no specific procedures to follow as to its use. Teachers were free to select experiences from the handbook as needed to implement their program. The Digitak Form, Children's Experience Record was not used in the control centers.

3. Florida Experimental Centers

   The be[illegible]etroit Head Start curricular program was implemented with a multi-level training program designed to

foster perceptual skills. A perceptual training program and the assessment of the children as measured by the Marianne Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, 1963 standardization were features of this program.

4. Frostig Control Center

The basic perceptual-conceptual multi-sensory program was the curriculum at this center. The children were pre- and posttested on the same instruments as was used in the modified Frostig Experimental Center, but did not receive the Frostig Perceptual Training Program.

5. Bruce Balcomb Experimental Center

In addition to the basic Detroit Head Start curriculum, the children in this center were given selected mobility training exercises as recommended in the Bruce Balcomb program. The children were pre- and posttested for handedness, footedness, and eyedness as recommended by the Bruce Balcomb program.

6. Bruce Balcomb Control Center

The children were tested on the same instruments as those in the Bruce Balcomb Experimental Center, but not given the mobility training exercises of the Bruce Balcomb program.

7. Bereiter Experimental Center

The curriculum at this center was the Beginning Language Program developed to accompany the book, Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool by Carl Bereiter and Siegfried Engelmann. The organization of the classroom, uses of material, and methods employed by the teacher and the center staff were specifically prescribed by the Bereiter curriculum.

The program at the Bereiter Experimental Center provided for periods of language, mathematics, music, and food activities (including a snack and lunch) during the daily Head Start session. There was no scheduled play period. Stories were read to children upon arrival. In preparation for discussal time, children were encouraged to use puzzles, and other manipulative materials (usually 20 minutes). The Teacher prepared audio-visual materials such as bulletin boards, charts, and pictures were not in evidence, as it was felt that these materials would distract from the children's ability to pay attention to the instruction being given.

Another study designed to develop a check list to be utilized in describing children's play and behavior during play periods and provide a more systematic arrangement of play description and observation was conducted during the Head Start Program at Fairbanks School. This was an exploratory study to develop a check list which could be used on a follow-up study of the children who had been enrolled at the center and would be enrolled in the kindergarten during the regular school year.

The total sample studied in this assessment of motor-perceptual skills of children and curricular methods was 373. All subjects were enrolled in the 1967 Detroit Summer Head Start Program.

Procedures

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Human Development Inventory Test of School Readiness were administered to all subjects at the beginning and end of the Summer Head Start Program. All testing was completed by qualified testers under the direction of the Detroit Public Schools Department of Research and Development.

Children in the Frostig Experimental and Control Centers were also given and pre-tested with Marianne Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception. Children in the Human Relations Experimental and Control Centers were pre- and post-tested for Cultural and Visual Readiness in three areas, Verbalness, Performance, and Synthesis. These tests were administered under the direction of the coordinators in each center.

Teachers and classroom personnel were given opportunities to respond to evaluative questionnaires at the end of the program. Teachers of the Experimental Centers using the Head Start Children's Experience Record attended three conferences with a representative of the Research Department and the testing coordinator to discuss practical problems encountered in the use of the experimental handbook, Young Children in School and the Head Start Children's Experience Record.

Observations were made at all centers participating in the study, except the center developing the play check list by the Research Department personnel and the test coordinator.

Description of Instruments and Materials Studied

1. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test is a picture vocabulary test designed to provide an estimate of the subjects' verbal intelligence through measuring his hearing vocabulary.

2. The Human Development Inventory Test of School Readiness is a test which is based on the developmental and learning principles, perceptual and conceptual differentiation abilities of the child. It is an individual performance test for the quantitative and qualitative evaluation of school readiness.

3. The Marianne Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception yields scores in five major perceptual areas: eye-motor coordination, figure ground, form constancy, position in space, and spatial relations.

4. The Human Relations Screening Sheet was an adaptation of a longer model in the battery of tests suggested by the Human Relations Program. This sheet was developed to assess handedness after observation of five tasks requiring use of the hands, footedness after observation of three tasks requiring use of the feet, and eyedness after observation of three tasks in sighting points.

A final determination of intensity (experimental treatment) to be made for each child.

The handbook, Young Children in School, is a booklet designed to assist prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers in identifying curriculum practices that will aid her in teaching the skills necessary for successful school experience. Activities and materials are listed under specific skills that are taught: auditory discrimination and memory, visual discrimination and memory, perceptive thinking (concrete and abstract), motor control (fine and large), and tactile experiences. Most of the activities included in this handbook are from issues of Instructo.* This handbook has been a joint effort of the Early Childhood Education Articulation Committee of the Detroit Public Schools whose members are

Charlotte Gaines, Supervisor of Kindergarten
Jean O'Brien, Research Associate
Bertha Boyd Matthews, Language Development Specialist
Rosalind Bruton, Director of Project Follow Through

The "Head Start Children's Experience Record" is a checklist prepared on an optical scanning form. It was designed to keep a record of both the depth and variety of learning experiences a subject had in the skill areas of auditory and visual discrimination, perceptive thinking, motor control, and tactile learning. The teacher was asked to record the number of times a child had experience in the skill areas. It was hoped that the checklist might help teachers focus on the recommended skill areas and select appropriate activities as suggested in the handbook, Young Children in School. At the same time, the sheet could be examined for the frequency count of the materials and kinds of activities selected to provide facilitation and reinforcement of learning experiences in the skill areas recommended.

Two games, "Audio Color Dominoes," and "Landscape Peg Set" (Playskool Co.) were distributed to the Detroit Head Start Experimental with checklist centers. Teachers were asked to acquaint children with these games and encourage the frequent use of these materials. The designs, shapes, and colors of these materials could be useful in optional visual discrimination practice as well as reinforcement of color and number concepts. No special evaluation of these materials was planned.

The Frostig Experimental Groups used materials designed to foster sensory motor training and body awareness. Walking boards, crawl through tunnels, balance boards, "balls on a string," and floor mats were furnished for the training rooms.

Only floor mats for rolling and crawling were provided as special materials in the Home Behavior training room.

All centers were furnished the regular complement of Head Start supplies and play equipment. All centers in this study received the services and benefits of the regular Head Start Program.

Method

Of 110 Head Start Centers, 17 Head Start Centers were randomly selected to participate in this study. All centers were located in the inner city area and were

*Publications for Kindergarten Teachers, Department of Early Childhood Education, Detroit Public Schools.

existed according to such factors as income, value of education of head, etc. Eight of these centers were designated as experimental centers. Seven centers were designated control centers. The Detroit Experimental Center had no specific control center as it was felt that any one of the five Detroit Head Start Control Centers would be acceptable as a control center.

Children participating in the study were randomly selected from the community adjacent to each center. The final experimental and control study groups and number of children included in the study at each center are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Name of Group	Center	Number of Children
Detroit Head Start Experimental Centers (Pre-Experience Record)	A	60
	B	28
	C	48
	D	15
	E	59
Detroit Head Start Control Centers	F	53
	G	46
	H	56
	I	53
	J	53
Beverly Experimental Center	K	53
Beverly Control Center	L	48
Green Acres Experimental Center	M	100
Green Acres Control Center	N	60
Services Experimental Center	O	50

Observations of Test Results

Data from the 1967 Head Start Program are presented in Tables II to VI which show the amount of change from pretest to posttest on four variables which give an assessment of children's readiness for school. Data are reported for the total Head Start Sample as well as for boys, ages 3 years 0 months through 3 years 11 months and 5 years 0 months through 5 years 11 months and girls in the same age ranges.

The data in Table IV, indicate that the verbal block grade equivalent improvement on the (1) level of significance (or better) on the vocabulary and verbal usage subtests. Vocabulary, verbal usefulness for school, achievement ability measurement, and environmental behavior. The following grouped areas for these variables are discussed below to give a clearer understanding of the importance of the grade scores:

1. The vocabulary variable indicates the level of language development and use as index of the child's understanding of words the meaning and use of words and verbs.

2. The scores generated for the Readiness Verbal variable are predictive of the present level of both reading readiness and academic readiness.

3. The Achievement-Ability variable measures generalizations in completing tasks, independence in working with activities, task-persistence, and response to environment as it pertains to the method and quantity of thinking.

4. The Social-Emotional variable indicates the level of emotional maturity of the child and gives an indication of the child's ability to adjust in the school situation. Important in this measurement are motivation, grade for self, and self-knowledge.

Reference to Table III reveals that boys in the kindergarten had lower beginning scores on all variables than girls of the same age. The mean gain in vocabulary was scores for both boys and girls was 1.2; however, the lowest score of girls was 1.3 higher than that of the boys. The boys' gain score of 2.7 in overall readiness (significant at .01) was 0.8 points higher than the girls significant gain score of 6.8 in overall readiness.

Table IV

Summary of Vocabulary and Readiness Test
Results of Final Post Pilot Sample, Summer 1967

Growth Areas	Pretest	Posttest	Changes
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	36.0	38.0	+2.0
Sressen Developmental Controls Test of School Readiness			
Readiness Total	46.0	50.0	+6.7
Achievement-Ability	49.7	55.6	+5.9
Social-Emotional	48.3	49.4	+ 1.0

* = .01
All changes were significant at .01

Table [illegible]

Comparisons of Boys and Girls at Different Age Levels
Means of Scores on Previous and Successive with the Peabody Picture Vocabulary
Test and the Denver Developmental Sentence Test on School Readiness
Head Start--Title[illegible] Sample, 1967

Growth Area	Raw Scores of Pupils 4.0 - 5.11 Years Old			Raw Scores of Pupils 5.0 - 6.0 Years Old		
	Pretests	Posttests	Gain	Pretests	Posttests	Gain
Vocabulary						
Boys	33.0	35.4	2.0	37.0	40.1	2.1**
Girls	34.8	36.7	2.0	38.8	40.0	1.2
Sentences Total						
Boys	37.3	47.0	9.7**	45.7	53.6	7.9**
Girls	45.3	56.1	6.8**	47.8	57.1	9.3**
Achievement-Ability						
Boys	33.3	40.9	1.6*	33.9	41.8	1.9**
Girls	41.8	46.3	4.5	45.1	48.6	3.5**
Social-Emotional						
Boys	46.6	47.9	1.3	45.7	47.0	1.3*
Girls	47.8	49.7	+.2	47.4	48.8	1.4*

* = 75 boys, 75 girls, age 4.0 - 4.11 ** = 38 boys, 38 girls, age 5.0 - 6.0
significant at .05 significant at .01

Table 39
Table 37

Comparisons by Sex of Pupils at Different Age Levels
Means of Scores on Previous and Successive with the Peabody Picture Vocabulary
Test and the Denver Developmental Sentence Test of School Readiness
Head Start--Title[illegible] Sample, 1967

Growth Area	Raw Scores of Girls			Raw Scores of Boys		
	Pretests	Posttests	Gain	Pretests	Posttests	Gain
Vocabulary						
Age 4.0 - 4.11	34.8	36.7	2.0	33.0	35.4	2.0
Age 5.0 - 6.0	38.8	40.0	1.2	37.0	40.1	2.1**
Sentences Total						
Age 4.0 - 4.11	45.3	56.1	6.8**	37.3	47.0	9.7**
Age 5.0 - 6.0	47.8	57.1	9.3**	45.7	53.6	7.9**
Achievement-Ability						
Age 4.0 - 4.11	41.8	46.3	4.5	33.3	40.9	1.6*
Age 5.0 - 6.0	45.1	48.6	3.5**	33.9	41.8	1.9**
Social-Emotional						
Age 4.0 - 4.11	47.8	49.7	+.2	46.6	47.9	1.3
Age 5.0 - 6.0	47.4	48.8	1.4*	45.7	47.0	1.3*

* = 75 pupils, age 4.0 - 4.11 ** = 75 pupils, age 4.0 - 4.11
* = 38 pupils, age 5.0 - 6.0 ** = 38 pupils, age 5.0 - 6.0
significant at .05 significant at .01

Table V

Summary of Vocabulary and Readiness Test Results from
Experimental and Control Centers--1967 Detroit Summer Head Start Program

Identification of Sample	N	Peabody Picture Vocabulary		Brenner Developmental Gestalt Readiness Test	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
TOTAL HEAD START SAMPLE	373	36.8	38.8**	26.8	32.9**
Boys, Age 4-4.11	94	33.5	35.4	27.5	27.2**
Boys, Age 5-6.0	92	37.9	40.3**	25.7	33.6**
Girls, Age 4-4.11	96	34.8	36.7	25.3	32.1**
Girls, Age 5-6.0	91	38.8	40.0	27.8	27.1**
HEAD START, EXPERIENCE RECORD EXPERIMENTAL CENTERS					
Center A	22	35.5	37.3	32.3	41.9**
Center B	18	31.6	42.6**	30.0	37.6
Center C	16	27.5	39.7**	26.2	42.2
Center D	13	41.7	42.9	27.6	44.0
Center E	19	41.6	43.0	22.3	23.9
HEAD START, EXPERIENCE RECORD CONTROL CENTERS					
Center F	19	39.6	40.2	23.6	41.6**
Center G	16	37.4	38.8	25.3	30.1**
Center H	12	36.1	36.2	15.2	25.9**
Center I	13	40.8	38.8	30.6	30.3
Center J	13	39.5	42.9	32.7	37.7**
BEREITER EXPERIMENTAL					
Center X	12	32.1	34.7	28.4	35.1**
FROSTIG PROGRAM					
Center Y (Experimental)	13	34.0	38.9**	28.3	32.1
Center T (Control)	14	37.9	41.9*	30.4	32.9
DOMAN DELACATO PROGRAM					
Center Z (Experimental)	111	36.6	37.1	25.3	30.9**
Center S (Control)	62	40.7	41.9	28.2	29.0

**Difference between pre- and posttest significant at .01
*Difference between pre- and posttest significant at .05

Table VI

Percentage of Rural Church Pupils' Attending Levels of School Satisfactory—Grouped Central Test

	Degrees of Satisfactory															
	Low				Low Average				High Average				High			
	Overlapping		Duplicating		Overlapping		Duplicating		Overlapping		Duplicating		Overlapping		Duplicating	
	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S
[illegible]																
[illegible] Rural Church Sample	173	39	97	32	93	27	122	38	43	13	38	13	23	6	36	11
[illegible] Sample	38	40	36	37	43	26	37	39	20	12	23	16	4	8	12	8
[illegible] Sample	81	46	43	28	30	29	36	35	23	13	33	32	17	10	22	16
	Intelligence				Math				Average				Total		Accomplishment	
	Overlapping		Duplicating		Overlapping		Duplicating		Overlapping		Duplicating		Overlapping		Duplicating	
	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S
[illegible]																
[illegible] Rural Church Sample	60	80	67	9	76	62	77	85	118	39	151	42	66	16	30	17	7	8	82	7
[illegible] Sample	36	47	17	12	33	62	66	30	36	36	73	30	23	16	26	16	4	3	6	4
[illegible] Sample	24	13	10	6	43	27	33	22	26	12	26	16	26	13	26	17	3	8	16	13
[illegible]																
[illegible] Rural Church Sample	33	11	10	3	66	16	11	13	127	42	151	48	67	22	63	22	23	11	40	16
[illegible] Sample	13	16	3	3	22	13	26	16	63	46	70	30	22	13	31	21	13	13	16	13
[illegible] Sample	10	6	3	3	22	16	17	13	64	33	63	46	43	23	36	23	13	13	26	17

Significant results appearing in Table XIII also indicate lower level scores on the four measured variables for boys than for girls in the 5½-6 age range. The vocabulary grade score for the boys (2.4, significant at .01) is below the grade expected for the grade (1.6) and gives evidence of nearly equal vocabulary functioning level for both boys and girls of this age at the time of the pretest. The girls, however, surpass the boys in significant mean gain on the other variables of total readiness, achievement-ability, and social-emotional behavior.

The data in Table IV were grouped for ease in examining performance of girls and boys separately. Both boys and girls of age 5 years made greater gains than boys and girls in the 6 year age group.

In the summary of vocabulary and readiness test results from the experimental and control centers reported in Table V, all centers except Franklin vocabulary and reading gains through centers 3 and 6 which have established lower pretest positions. The experimental gains are significant for centers 3, 1, 5, and 6. Of the centers supporting significant gains in one scores on the vocabulary test, the gain of 11.0 for Center 3 and 12.0 for Center 6 merit attention as the range in differences in one scores among on the same vocabulary test is -0.3 to +12.0

All centers support positive mean score gains in total overall readiness except Center 1. The gains are significant for Centers 4, 3, 6, 5, 1, 7, and 2.

The data of Table V further indicate that the overall readiness totals of the Head Start, Experimental Second Pretest schools show superiority over the Head Start, Experimental Second Experimental schools in mean gains except in Center 2, but inferiority to the Head Start, Experimental Second Experimental schools on the vocabulary mean gains in one scores. Three experimental centers 4, 3, and 6 also show superiority in overall readiness and inferiority on other measures.

The data presented in Table VI give an indication of the numbers and percents of children in the total Head Start, Inactive attending approximate levels of overall readiness for schools on both pretests and posttests. The total readiness scores in the mean improvement ratios resulting from the Revised Test. This score is used for comparisons to a school readiness classification as defined in the test manual for the above-average age of the child at the time of testing. The ranges of scores for determining readiness categories used in this testing were defined by Stevens as:

Low Readiness	0 - 25
Average (Low)	26 - 50
Average (High)	51 - 75
High	76 - 99

Included in the mean table are the achievement-ability and social-emotional behavior improvements of the total Head Start Inactive. The achievement-ability rating provides an index of functional ability at the time of testing which is predictive of potential performance in school. The social-emotional rating provides insights into the personality adjustments of the children. This rating is a projection of the relative strengths of a child in relations to responsibility, self-confidence, group interaction, activities, and interest in school and learning. The ranges of scores for determining categories of readiness for both the achievement-ability and social-emotional ratings are as follows:

Inadequate	0 - 12
Poor	13 - 19
Average	20 - 26
Good	27 - 33
Excellent	34 - 40

It can be observed that there is a positive shift in both numbers and percentage of children from the low readiness category right on through the high readiness designation from pretest to posttest.

The same positive shift in both numbers and percentage of children on the achievement ability and social-emotional behavior assessments is evident in the lower portion of the same table.* The shift is noting is from "inadequate" through "acceptable".

It may be noted that there was, for approximately one third of the children, an upward shift from pre- to posttesting in both readiness for reading and in achievement ability. The upward shift in social-emotional behavior from pre- to posttesting was considerably smaller, about one eighth of the pupils showed improvement. (These figures are approximations based on the assumption that the pupils lessons from pre- to posttesting were proportional among the 4 different ability or category groups on the pretesting.)

It may be noted in Table VI that there is, from pretest to posttest in reading readiness, an upward shift of about 11% or approximately 1/3 of the pupils (there was a loss of 20 pupils from pre- to posttest). There was an upward shift, from pretest to posttest achievement-ability, of about 9% or approximately 30% of the pupils. (There was only a loss of 2 pupils from pre- to posttest in this category. In the social-emotional behavior category, from pretest to posttest, there was an upward shift of about 7% or approximately 25% of the pupils. (There was a loss of 7 pupils from pretest to posttest in this category.)

Discussion

From the data presented on the Stroud Short Sight Sample (Table V), it can be observed that both subsamples and control groups made progress. Primary one of the subsamples control group at 0 and 3, shows significant improvement in the progress on achieving over the control control. Four of the control control show significant improvement in overall control readiness over the subsample control receiving lessons 3, shows significant gains due to 15.3 in overall control readiness.

The inference might be made that the less time spent in control groups on subject matter lessons the greater is eligibility gains improvement on visual-motor, but greater improvement on total control readiness. Further study is necessary to determine whether greater gains accompanies for lessons subject control groups on visual-motor development.

The question must be asked whether the subsamples of the Stroud Sample are representing on the purpose of overall readiness involving achievement-ability and social-emotional behavior assessment. The purpose of this is observed in the results of the lesser lessons subsamples (Table 3). While the lesser lessons control does not guarantee significant change in visual-motor, it generally does in overall control.

The patterns of significant differences in the data indicate that individuals receive may be a major factor which accounts for some of the differences. It is the observation's opinion, substantiated by objective data, that teachers should be evaluated on the basis of training, ability, and enthusiasm to work in programs with disadvantaged preschool children.

EVALUATION OF PERSONAL EXPERIENCE RECORD AND HANDBOOK--"YOUNG CHILDREN IN SCHOOL"

Teachers utilizing the children's Personal Experience Record responded to a questionnaire designed to evaluate the specific contribution of the record form to the experimental summer program. Only six of the teachers using the personal experience record, returned the questionnaire which asked that questions be answered on a (n-7) rating scale, with 7 being the best possible rating, 1 being the lowest point the rating and 0 indicating that the question either did not apply to their situation or that the teacher could not answer the question.

The following questions concerned the Children's Personal Experience Record:

1. To what extent did the Children's Personal Experience Record contribute to an awareness of the importance of <u>different activities</u> in preparing pupils for reading?

2. To what extent did the Children's Personal Experience Record contribute to an awareness of the <u>skill teaching</u> important in preparing pupils for reading? (Auditory and visual discrimination, concrete and abstract quantitative thinking, etc.)

3. To what extent did the value of using the Children's Personal Experience Record compensate for the extra time required for filling it out?

The ratings tallied for each question were:

	0 Not Applicable	1 Low	2 Low Average	3 High Average	4 High	5 Very High
Question One		17% (1)	50% (3)			33% (2)
Question Two			50% (3)	17% (1)		33% (2)
Question Three		17% (1)	33% (2)	33% (2)	17% (1)	

N = 6 (only teachers using the English form)

All other experimental and control teachers were given the experimental handbook, <u>Young Children in School</u> to use as a resource in identifying curriculum practices which aid in teaching the skills necessary for successful school experience, and aid in selecting activities for a multi-sensorial presentation.

The following questions were used to evaluate the experimental handbook, <u>Young Children in School</u>:

4. To what extent did you actually make use of the suggestions in the experimental handbook, <u>Young Children in School</u>?

5. To what extent did the handbook assist you in identifying curriculum practices which aid in teaching the skills necessary for successful school experience?

6. To what extent did the listing of activities and materials under specific skills taught, aid in your choice of activities for a balanced preschool curriculum?

7. To what extent does the selection of activities and materials in the handbook allow for the individual differences of children in a preschool program?

8. How strongly would you recommend the use of the handbook, Young Children in School in the regular year-long kindergarten program?

The ratings submitted by each group of teachers are presented separately. Experimental teachers using the Children's Personal Experience Record and instructed to use the booklet Young Children In School on a regular basis in selecting activities for the children's program presented these ratings: (The low ratings are not given by the same person.)

	0 Not Applicable	1 Low	2 Low Average	3 High Average	4 High	5 Very High
Question Four			17% (1)	67% (4)		17% (1)
Question Five		17% (1)	50% (3)	17% (1)	17% (1)	
Question Six		17% (1)		50% (3)	33% (2)	
Question Seven	17% (1)		33% (2)	17% (1)	33% (2)	
Question Eight		17% (1)		33% (2)	33% (2)	17% (1)

N = 6

All other teachers in the Experimental Program were given the handbook, Young Children In School but were given no specific instructions regarding its utilization. Twenty-eight teachers submitted these ratings:

	0 Not Applicable	1 Low	2 Low Average	3 High Average	4 High	5 Very High
Question Four	25% (7)		7% (2)	36% (10)	18% (5)	14% (4)
Question Five	18% (5)		7% (2)	25% (7)	21% (6)	29% (8)
Question Six	21% (6)		4% (1)	21% (6)	25% (7)	29% (8)
Question Seven	25% (8)			36% (11)	25% (7)	7% (2)
Question Eight	18% (5)			7% (2)	36% (9)	43% (12)

N = 28

Discussion

Digital Form

The data presented indicate that eighty-seven percent of teachers who were using the Digital Form did not feel that its use contributed to an awareness of the importance of different activities in preparing pupils for reading. Eighty-three percent of the teachers using the Digital Form rated it very high in aiding them aware of the importance of different activities in preparing pupils for reading.

Eighty-seven percent of the teachers utilizing the Children's Experience Record Form rated it average and Eighty-three percent rated it very high. On the basis of these ratings, it may be concluded that teachers consider it to be a satisfactory tool contributing to an awareness of the child teaching important in preparing pupils for reading.

Eighty-three percent of the teachers indicated that the values of using the Form compensated for the extra time required filling it out. Eighty-six percent rated it average and seventeen percent rated it high. Seventeen percent rated it as low.

Experimental Textbook

The experimental textbook, Young Children in School, was distributed to all teachers in the experimental groups. Teachers who used the Children's Experimental Record Form were asked to use the textbook as a sourcebook for the selection of varied experiences in all readiness categories. The other teachers were free to select any experiences from any category they wished. The percentual value of using the textbook differed between the groups of teachers.

Eighty-four percent of the teachers using the Record Form made moderate use of suggestions found in the textbook, while seventeen percent used the textbook very extensively. In contrast thirty-three percent of the teachers who did not use the Record Form used the textbook very extensively, while forty-two percent made moderate use of it.

Seventeen percent of the Record Form users and fifty percent of the other teachers felt that the textbook was very helpful in identifying curriculum practices which are in teaching skills necessary for successful school experience.

The listing of activities and materials under specific skills taught aided thirty-three percent of record form users and fifty-three percent of the other teachers in choosing activities for a balanced preschool curriculum.

Teachers were in agreement that the selection of activities and materials in the textbook were alike for individual differences of children in a preschool program. Thirty-three percent of record form users and thirty-three percent of the others rated this use as high. Only seventeen percent of the record form users rated this as low.

Using a high and very high rating, fifty percent of record form users and seventy-five percent of others highly encouraged use of the textbook, Young Children in School, in the regular preschool kindergarten program.

Many teachers were heard on their individual teaching styles in connection with the use of practical use of the suggestions found in the handbook. Of the participating teachers responding to this question, the following distributions were noted:

Problem	Frequency
1. Materials are available to implement suggestions (this involved distributive time problems, warehousing, etc.).	10
2. Insufficient time to try some of the activities because of program schedule.	10
3. Some activities were too advanced for these pupils.	8

Discussion

From the data on the Total Deaf Start Program and the questionnaires returned by teachers, it can be surmised that while classes of teachers using several items were significantly overall gains, those teachers did not use the value of using the handbook as highly and consistently as other teachers. This may be attributed to the fact that these teachers felt the pressures of meeting the weekly highlight from as well as trying to balance their activities of activities from all other areas represented in the handbook. Many of the experimental records from these said that there simply was not enough time for everything. These teachers expressed appreciation for the addition of a resource aide to their staffs and those to remain in the experimental program when they were given the opportunity to be relieved of this extra responsibility.

The other teachers generally agreed that using the handbook was of great value in providing a balance of activities represented in fostering general readiness. While children in these teachers' classes achieved significant total readiness gains, their vocabulary gains were not significant. The total readiness gain testing paragraphs, concepts and action skills gains. These children may have had many good experiences but not enough of the kind that fosters vocabulary development on a regular basis.

In introducing and implementing the activities in the handbook, there were difficulties in finding as to how each teacher could be most available materials. In feedback sessions, this evaluation noted that classroom school teachers felt hampered in their activities of activities suggested in the handbook because specific materials for these activities were not provided. Teachers trained in preschool and kindergartens were glutted to suggest ways of available materials.

Parent aides and student aides employed in the LSD Deaf Start Experimental Centers were given an opportunity to make recommendations for improvements of the experimental programs in their centers. The five responses have been categorized and are reported without interpretation in the following table.

Table VII

Accommodations Provided	Programs	
	Parent Wife	Student Wife
Provide play time for children (only 30 minutes per day)		
Center A	5	4
Run each meeting of children		
Center B	3	3
Run baby sitters		
Center C	3	
Run each time for lunch and snacks		
Center D	3	
Quit Program		
Center E	5	
Center F		2
Center G		2
Center H		2
Center I		2
Center J		2
Quit more cooperative teachers		
Center K		2
Center L		2
Teachers are busy		
Center M		3
Quit more interesting programs for parents		
Center N	2	
Center O	2	
Center P	2	
Center Q	2	
Center R	2	
Problem video seen discouraging		
Center S	5	
Center T		5

Table VII

(continued)

Recommendation from Canberra	Response	
	Parent side	Student side
Short Course Goal Work programs		
Section A	A	
Section B	A-B	
Section C	B	
Work outside activities		
Section D	A	
Section E	C	
Supplies should arrive by time		
Section G	A	
Section H	C-D	

Conclusion

1. The data obtained in this study provide baseline data for future comparison of goal work habits.

2. Differences in goal work in vocational and school subjects may be the main goal work habits in secondary goal importance (P).

3. The goal work importance should public school should be goal work importance should participate school to the goal of goal school subjects (Table C), the secondary to the goal work, should goal should participate school to the vocational goal goal to be done.

4. The home schools importance or service importance group goal should work and the private importance or school group to the goal of goal school subjects, the secondary to the private importance or school group to the goal to vocational be done.

5. The data should a recommendation the participation of students to service students of the importance should observe to be the goal should goal to consider to private universal courses to goal work goal.

   a. Provision of the handbook, home folders to school, to parent students to secondary importance to goal goal to work goal to be done importance to done.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]